DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 017 HE 010 483

AUTHOR Bennett, C. A.; Griffitt, W. B.
TITLE Survey of Faculty Opinion at Kansas State University. Research Report No. 35.
INSTITUTION Kansas State Univ., Manhattan. Office of Educational Research.
PUB DATE Feb 76
NOTE 21p.
AVAILABLE FROM Office of Educational Research, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Faculty Evaluation; Fringe Benefits; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Job Satisfaction; *Organizational Climate; Questionnaires; Research Projects; School Surveys; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Retirement; Teacher Salaries; Teacher Welfare; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Kansas State University; *Teacher College Relationship

ABSTRACT

A survey of all 1,000 Kansas State University faculty was conducted in August 1975 by the KSU chapter of the American Association of University Professors. Results from the 459 usable returns are detailed in statistical and narrative form. Ninety percent of the faculty indicated high degrees of liking their positions. Although a number of areas were found where many faculty see the need for improvements--such as salary, finge benefits, and planning for job security--there seem to be no "burning issues" at this beginning of a new university administration. The survey form is appended. (Author/LBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

KSU

OFFICE OF
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

RESEARCH
REPORT
35

ED160017

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kansas State University - D. Hoyt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE010483

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Office of Educational Research

Kansas State University

Research Report #35

SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

C. A. Bennett, Industrial Engineering Department
W. B. Griffitt, Psychology Department

February 1976

ABSTRACT

A survey of all 1000 KSU faculty was conducted in August 1975 by the Kansas State University Chapter of AAUP. Results from the 459 usable returns were given in some detail. Ninety percent of the faculty indicated high degrees of liking their positions. While a number of areas were found where many faculty see the need for improvements - salaries, fringes, planning for job security - there seem to be no "burning issues" at this beginning of a new University administration.

FORWARD

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is an organization of faculty members and other interested persons which represents faculty interests to college and university administrators, governing boards and legislators. Nationally, for over six decades it has had a significant impact on higher education in the United States. Its most noteworthy accomplishments are related to academic freedom, tenure and faculty salaries.

In the spring of 1975, the Kansas State University Chapter was particularly concerned about faculty "layoffs" (dismissals) due to retrenchment at various colleges and universities in Kansas and elsewhere. A Job Security Committee was established to examine this problem. The Committee felt that it would be helpful to know faculty opinion on this subject. It became obvious that faculty opinion about related concerns salary/fringes, faculty evaluation/accountability and collective bargaining could be usefully collected at the same time.

Typically chapter action has been based upon the opinions of the relatively few members, generally officers, who attended business meetings. However informed and intelligent this group may be, it cannot be expected to represent the entire faculty on all issues. Thus, a survey responded to by a substantial percentage of the faculty should prove to be a superior guide to faculty attitudes and status.

Many people contributed to the effort. Bill Griffitt agreed to direct the survey. The chapter officers and committee chairpersons made suggestions. Don Hoyt, Educational Resources, helped identify issues and develop the questionnaire; his office conducted the data analysis.

Feedback of results was given at a public meeting by Bill Griffitt. Presentations of specifically relevant results and written-in comments was also given to AAUP committees. This document constitutes the final reporting.

Corwin A. Bennett
Chapter President, 1975-76

SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

CORWIN A. BENNETT AND WILLIAM B. GRIFFITT

A questionnaire was mailed on August 20, 1975 to 1000 KSU faculty members who were teaching or working for the Library at least one-tenth time. They were asked to return the completed questionnaire by August 29. By that date, 420 replies were returned. During the next two weeks, an additional 39 replies were received, making a total of 459 available for analysis. Twelve more were received after results were processed, making a total return of 47.1 percent. The percentage of usable returns from each college was as follows:

College	Percent
Agriculture	39
Architecture/Design	35
Arts & Sciences	47
Business	39
Education	64
Engineering	48
Home Economics	57
Library	69
Veterinary Medicine	37
University Overall	46

The questionnaire requested no identifying information and explicitly promised that no attempt would be made to identify respondents. Nonetheless, a few faculty members expressed concern that they could be identified because of their atypical demographic characteristics. While this possibility and a negative image of AAUP among some faculty members probably depressed returns somewhat, 471 responses seem substantial. This is especially true since no follow-up was attempted and since a few faculty members reported that they did not receive questionnaires.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ANALYSIS

The questionnaire consisted of major sections dealing with demographic information, position satisfaction, faculty evaluation, retirement and job security, and faculty relationships with legislative and policy groups.[1]

[1] Attitudes toward AAUP as an organization were also surveyed, but since the results on these items were of major interest only to members of the Association, they are not reported herein.

A copy is included in the appendix.

Data analysis consisted of developing frequency distributions and two-way contingency tables. Two statistics were computed -- X^2 (to test the statistical significance of a contingency) and λ (to indicate the percentage increase in predictability by virtue of a contingency). The contingencies considered were sex, rank, years at KSU, tenure status, age, college, and AAUP membership.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the number and percentage of respondents by demographic category. The median age of respondents was forty. Three-quarters were male, principally and equally divided among the three professorial ranks. Median service at Kansas State was between five and ten years. Two-thirds had tenure. Fifteen percent of the respondents were AAUP members (compared to 11 percent of the faculty who are members).

Results regarding job satisfaction are summarized in Table 2.

Satisfaction

Over 46 percent of the faculty said they liked their positions "very much", and another 43 percent checked "like". Thus, 9 out of 10 selected one of the top two alternatives on a six point scale. Percentages in these two categories ranged from lows of 78 percent (Business) and 81 percent (Engineering) to highs of 100 percent in Architecture/Design and the Library.[2] A significant increase in satisfaction occurred as one moved up the professional ranks, but instructors were almost as satisfied as professors. No significant relationships were found between satisfaction and sex, age, or years at KSU.

Twenty one specific "issues" which might affect satisfaction were listed -- six reflecting general support, six on policies or practices, five on the general listed atmosphere and surroundings, and four on security and economic welfare. On 20 of the 21 items, a greater percent checked "Positive effect" than "Negative effect", and on 16 "Positive effect" was also chosen more frequently than "No effect".

The area of greatest satisfaction was "general atmosphere or surroundings", where over half of the respondents regarded each of the five items positively. The Manhattan community headed the list (82 percent positive) followed closely by Quality of departmental colleagues (73 percent).

Four of the "General Support" items were responded to favorably by a majority of respondents, the two items regarding the availability of research funds (either extramural or intramural) were rated as having no effect on satisfaction by the majority of respondents.

---

[2] Subgroup differences are discussed only if the X^2 value was statistically significant and λ (increase in predictability due to the existing contingency) was at least 5 percent.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

AGE	N	%	
Under 30	43	9.4	
30-39	185	40.4	
40-49	122	26.7	
50-59	78	17.0	
60-64	24	5.2	
65-69	6	1.3	
SEX			
Female	80	18.4	
Male	354	81.6	
COLLEGE/UNIT			% RETURN
Agriculture	90	19.7	39
Architecture & Design	13	2.9	35
Arts & Sciences	196	43.0	47
Business Administration	9	2.0	39
Education	30	6.6	64
Engineering	48	10.5	48
Home Economics	21	4.6	57
Veterinary Medicine	27	5.9	37
Library	22	4.8	69
Total	456	100.0	46
YEARS AT KSU			
Under 5	172	37.6	
5 - 10	147	32.1	
11-15	43	9.4	
16-20	37	8.1	
21+	59	12.9	
TENURE STATUS			
Tenured	298	66.1	
Not Tenured	153	33.9	
AAUP STATUS			
Member	69	15.3	
Non-Member	382	84.7	

TABLE 2

JOB SATISFACTION AND ITS SOURCES FOR KSU FACULTY MEMBERS
(IN PERCENTAGES)

A. How well do you like your position?

Like very much	46.5
Like it	43.5
Like it a little	4.6
Dislike a little	2.9
Dislike	1.8
Dislike very much	0.9

B. How do the following affect your satisfaction?

	Positive Effect	No Effect	Negative Effect
General Support			
Attitude of governor,legislators	57.8	19.2	23.0
Dean's attitude toward your department	51.1	28.6	20.3
Administrative recognition & appreciation	53.4	23.1	23.5
Acad. support facil (libr,computer,etc.)	52.1	26.7	21.2
Avail of extramural funds	30.5	42.7	26.8
Avail of intram research funds	26.8	50.7	22.5
Policies & Practices			
Policy,pract. re: tenure & promotion	41.4	32.7	25.9
Provisn for fac input into decisns,plcy	53.1	20.8	26.1
Resource allocation to colleges	27.8	36.9	35.3
Resource allocation to departments	41.3	33.3	25.4
Resource allocation w/in departments	53.5	21.8	24.7
Allocation of intram. research funds	26.4	54.5	19.1
Atmosphere,Surroundings			
Acad. charact. of typical students	62.3	18.4	18.4
Opp. to interact outside dept/discipline	53.2	32.0	14.8
Quality of department colleagues	72.5	15.9	11.6
Quality of U.faculty in general	53.6	34.5	11.9
The Manhattan community	81.6	11.1	7.3
Security and Economic Welfare			
National supply/demand picture	41.3	39.6	19.1
Personal job security	66.5	24.8	8.6
Adequacy of "Fringe Benefits"	39.0	28.2	32.9
Current salary	43.5	22.0	34.5

C. "I would actively seek a new position if teaching loads were increased":

Agree = 31.7 Undecided = 38.2 Disagree = 30.8

On all four of the "Security and Economic Welfare" items, a positive rating was made by a plurality. However, only "personal job security" was regarded positively by a majority (67 percent).

Results were more mixed on the six "Policies and Practices" items. A majority gave positive ratings to the opportunity for faculty input into decisions affecting them and to resource allocation within the department. In addition, a plurality regarded "tenure and promotion policies" and "resource allocation to the departments" favorably. On the other hand, most (55 percent) said that allocations of intramural research funds had no effect on their satisfaction, and respondents were nearly equally divided on the effect of resource allocations to the colleges.

The demographic variable most closely related to specific satisfaction ratings was academic rank. Satisfaction increased significantly from rank-to-rank on five items -- tenure/promotion policies, opportunity for faculty input into policies; resource allocation to the colleges; resource allocation to the departments; and the Manhattan community as a place to live. On the other hand, satisfaction with the fringe benefit program decreased from rank to rank.

One item -- the national "supply and demand" picture in one's discipline -- was reacted to differently by those in different colleges. Faculty members in Arts and Sciences (32 percent) and Education (23 percent) were more inclined to view this as a negative factor than were those in Architecture and Design, Business Administration, and Home Economics (all zero percent).

A final satisfaction item asked if an increased teaching load would result in the respondent actively seeking another position. Since the faculty were about evenly divided among ("agree", "undecided", and "disagree"), there is reason to believe that the high degree of satisfaction is contingent on no significant changes in employment conditions. Faculty members under 40 were more likely to agree than were those over 60 (44 versus 0 percent). There were also some differences among colleges on this item; 50 percent of those in Architecture/Design agreed, compared to only 17 percent in Engineering and 18 percent in Agriculture.

Faculty Evaluation

As Table 3 shows, most respondents were supportive of the written faculty evaluation program used at KSU during the past two years. The aspect of this program which faculty regarded as weakest was a lack of useful suggestions for improvement. Faculty were generally satisfied with the bases of evaluations (teaching, research, etc.). However, a substantial minority (35%) felt that the department head's judgment was too heavily weighted. In comparison with earlier salary adjustments, the faculty generally rated recent ones as "More fair" (43%) or "About as fair" (43%).

In this section, several responses were contingent largely upon factors reflecting age and experience (e.g., age, years at KSU, rank).

TABLE 3

ATTITUDES TOWARD FACULTY EVALUATION
(IN PERCENTAGES)

General Reactions	Agree	Undecided	Disagree
Too little fac.input into department eval system	19.6	18.0	62.4
My department's system needs considerable improve	31.3	25.9	42.8
I've received adequate feedback on my evaluation	52.3	23.0	24.8
I've received useful suggestions for improvement	37.3	24.2	38.5
Student ratings should not be used for fac eval	31.2	23.2	45.6
Favor return to "informal evaluation system"	26.9	29.9	43.2
Replace "merit salary" with standard pay scale	26.7	18.7	54.6

Department Evaluation Emphasis	Too Much	About Right	Too Little
Teaching	6.1	70.2	23.6
Research and creative work	21.5	63.4	15.0
University service	11.9	72.1	15.9
Community service	14.1	67.1	18.9
Service to professional discipline	5.5	73.5	21.1
Judgment of department head	34.9	62.5	2.5
Judgment of colleagues	9.3	68.0	22.7
Judgment of students	22.0	67.2	10.8

Compared with previous years, my salary adjustment for the last two years has been:

More fair	43.2
Less fair	14.3
About as fair	42.5

Those over 60 were the most critical of the written faculty evaluation system. Only 30 percent of this group felt recent salary adjustments had been more fair, and most (56 percent) favored replacing the "merit salary" philosophy with a standard pay scale based on experience and degree (versus 14 percent of the youngest group). "Veteran" faculty members (the older age groups, full professors, those with the longest tenure at KSU) were more likely to urge return to an "informal faculty evaluation system" than were less experienced members of the faculty. The same groups differed in their reaction to student ratings. For example, 62 percent of the "60 or over" group thought student ratings should not be used in faculty evaluation; for those under 30, this figure was 15 percent. Similarly, only 20 percent of those at KSU less than five years opposed the use of student ratings, while 54 percent of those with more than 20 years of KSU experience were opposed.

Retirement Plans and Job Security

Table 4 summarizes results for the 17 questions related to job security and retirement. Two questions were asked regarding retirement. Given present circumstances, 18 percent of the respondents said they expected to retire before 65, 36 percent at 65, and 46 percent after 65. If retirement salary benefits were improved, 44 percent said they would retire before 65, 32 percent at 65 and only 25 percent would work beyond 65. This squares with actual experience at the University of Pittsburgh and in a number of businesses where adequate pensions have induced many to retire early. No substantial relationships were found between these items and demographic variables.

Several questions were asked regarding job security. Forty one percent of the faculty felt that some non-tenured faculty would be dismissed due to enrollment declines by 1980 while only 19 percent felt that this would never happen. Slightly less than half felt that tenured faculty members would never be dismissed due to enrollment declines. However, most of the faculty (73 percent) rated their own chances of being dismissed as "very low", and even more (79 percent) felt their chances of getting another position as good as their KSU position were reasonably good.

Four options for dealing with job security problems were given high priority ratings by a majority of respondents. The most popular recommendation was for longer-range administration planning based on enrollment trends and faculty turnover rates. Over 60 percent recommended more generous early retirement inducements. The other two high priority items --"Expand educational opportunities for off-campus clienteles" and "Seek legislative approval for a reduced student-faculty ratio" were rated as high priority by bare majorities.

Three of the options were given low priority ratings by a majority of respondents. Heading this list was the proposal to reduce faculty salaries in order to avoid layoffs, rated "low" by over 80 percent. Two-thirds gave low ratings to "Unionize the faculty" followed by "Establishing tenure quotas" (58 percent "Low priority").

TABLE 4

RETIREMENT PLANS AND JOB SECURITY
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Retirement Expectations	Current	If Improved Benefits
Before 60	6.9	16.3
60 - 64	11.2	27.4
65	36.2	31.6
66 - 70	45.6	24.7

Job Security	Expect Dismissal Of	
1. Faculty Retrenchment Expectations	Non-tenured	Tenured
Never	19.3	45.0
By 1980	40.9	7.3
By 1985	28.8	22.9
After 1985	11.0	24.9
2. Personal Job Security	Retrench Dismissal	Find Eql Opportunity
Very low probability (Und.20%)	72.6	11.9
Low (20-39% chance)	13.8	9.2
Medium (40-59% chance)	9.1	28.3
High (60-79% chance)	2.0	22.7
Very high (80%+chance)	2.5	27.9

Recommended Priorities	PRIORITY		
	High	Medium	Low
Longer range admin planning based on enroll trends and faculty turnover	66.7	28.3	4.9
More generous retirement inducements	61.5	30.2	8.2
Expand off-campus clientele	53.9	36.4	9.7
Reduce student/faculty ratio	52.8	33.7	13.5
Prepare lay-off guidelines	45.5	38.2	16.4
Restrict new faculty hiring	38.7	42.5	18.8
Develop non-teaching roles for faculty	29.3	46.1	24.6
Expand "temporary" positions	27.1	40.0	32.9
Unionize the faculty	12.6	19.2	68.2
Establish tenure quotas	12.1	29.7	58.1
Reduce faculty salaries	3.8	14.9	81.3

Demographic variables were seldom related to job security issues to any degree. However, rank was highly related to perceived low probability of being dismissed. Of instructors, 52 percent thought this probability was very low, compared to 90 percent of professors. And priority given to defining precise "lay off" guidelines differed among the various colleges. Faculty members in Architecture/Design infrequently recommended this option, but 63 percent of those in Home Economics thought it deserved high priority.

Relations with Policy and Legislative Groups

As Table 5 shows, only 23 percent of the respondents were in favor of establishing a collective bargaining unit at KSU, while 26 percent said they would join such a unit if established. This contrasts sharply with the results of a 1971 poll of members at all six Regents institutions in which 64 percent said they would join a bargaining organization.[3]

Two other collective bargaining questions concerned the unit and the agent. Forty percent would prefer a unit consisting of KSU alone, while the next most popular alternative was a combination of all six Regents institutions (32 percent). If unionized, most faculty who expressed an opinion favored either a local faculty group (38 percent) or AAUP (30 percent). Faculty members who favored collective bargaining differed significantly from those who did not on these questions. A plurality of the former preferred the all-six-Regents bargaining unit (41 percent) and AAUP as the agent (42 percent); only 15 percent of collective bargaining advocates preferred a local group. Similarly, 54 percent of AAUP members preferred AAUP as an agent, whereas the most popular choice of non-AAUP members was a local faculty group (43 percent). There were also significant differences among the colleges in preferences for an agent. Veterinary Medicine (70 percent) and Agriculture (62 percent) were the strongest advocates of a local group. Education was the only college giving substantial support to an agent other than AAUP or a local group; 23 percent endorsed NEA as the most desirable agent. No one in Business preferred AAUP, while 48 percent of those in Home Economics did.

There were two questions on accountability. Fifty-three percent agreed that eventually some kind of public accountability scheme will be required, with only 15 percent disagreeing. Nine percent favored some "hours worked" procedure, while 84 percent elected one of two similar alternatives -- an "accomplishments procedure" or the current faculty evaluation procedure. Some significant variations existed among colleges; fairly large percentages of Education (22 percent) and Engineering (17 percent) faculty liked the hours worked alternative versus none in Architecture/Design.

Faculty were asked whether they should have freedom to communicate directly with the Board of Regents and the State Legislature. A majority (58 and 59 percent, respectively) favored such freedom; only 20 percent disagreed. The main contingencies on these items were those associated with rank and tenure. More instructors (74 percent) than professors (46 percent) favored these freedoms of communication. Similarly, somewhat more non-tenured than tenured faculty members reacted favorably (63 percent versus 56 percent).

---

[3]Allan, H. Dale. Professors and Collective Bargaining. Kansas State University, College of Business Administration, Manhattan, Ks., 1971 (Mimeo, 33pp).

TABLE 5

FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS WITH POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE GROUPS

Collective Bargaining Attitudes

1. Favor establishing a bargaining unit at Kansas State University.

   Agree = 23.3 Undecided = 32.2 Disagree = 44.5

2. Would join bargaining organization at Kansas State University.

   Agree = 26.4 Undecided = 40.4 Disagree = 33.3

3. Preferred bargaining unit.

KSU	= 40.2	KSU,KU, & WSU	= 12.2
KSU & KU	= 16.1	All 6 Institutions	= 31.5

4. Preferred agent.

Local faculty group	= 37.9	AFT	= 6.6
AAUP	= 30.4	Other Union	= 3.3
NEA	= 4.9	Don't know	=16.9

Accountability

1. Public accountability will be required.

   Agree = 53.4 Undecided = 31.5 Disagree = 15.1

2. Preferred accountability procedure.

Hours worked	= 8.9	Current faculty evaluation	= 43.1
Accomplishments	=40.5	Other	= 7.5

Communication with Policy/Legislative Groups

1. Faculty should be free to communicate directly with Regents.

   Agree = 57.5 Undecided = 22.2 Disagree = 20.2

2. Faculty should be free to communicate directly with legislators.

   Agree = 58.7 Undecided = 21.6 Disagree = 19.8

DISCUSSION

Faculty surveys can be useful for gaining perspective on faculty views. Too often, volunteered comments from a small number of faculty members are offered as "representative" of the faculty. Although a higher percent return would have been desirable and would produce more dependable conclusions, the reactions of over 450 faculty members is probably a better guide to faculty attitudes than is usually obtained from individuals or even from resolutions passed by AAUP or the Faculty Senate.

Faculty were asked about position satisfaction. Ninety percent reported liking their positions. Only a fantastic bias among the 46 percent returning questionnaires could substantially alter the conclusion that the faculty are generally satisfied with their positions at KSU. It seems unlikely that such a bias was present. It might be assumed that faculty members with "an axe to grind" would be more likely to respond than those who were content with the status quo. Therefore, if the attitudes expressed by the respondents are biased, the bias may well be an over-representation of relatively discontented faculty members.

One of the most remarkable outcomes of the survey was the degree of homogeneity of faculty opinion. There were some differences among colleges on University issues, and faculty members in some colleges were less happy than those in others. There were some apparent liberal-conservative differences among the colleges. Several issues did show an "age" or "experience" effect (age, tenure, rank, and/or years at KSU were related to differences in opinion). AAUP members generally expressed attitudes similar to those of nonmembers. No appreciable sex differences emerged. All in all, out of hundreds of comparisons, very few substantial differences of opinion existed among the various faculty subgroups.

A number of matters needing further attention were identified. By and large, none appeared to be "burning issues" among the faculty. According to the respondents, salaries and fringe benefits are still inadequate, modest improvements are needed in the systems for faculty evaluation, and long range planning in connection with further retrenchment should reflect certain priorities.

But things can change. In 1971, 64 percent of a sample of faculty members in Regents' institutions indicated they would join a collective bargaining unit; in this survey, only 26 percent of KSU faculty members said they would. In 1975, faculty members had experienced the benefits of two years of a three year program to make faculty salaries more competitive. In 1971, faculty members received no salary increase. Only a third of the respondents indicated that they would not seek another position if teaching loads at KSU were increased. Clearly, faculty satisfaction and morale are sensitive commodities. Legislative or administrative actions which lead faculty members to feel that their efforts are not appreciated or their work is not valued could easily change the results of this survey.

A union organizer recently suggested that it was too bad that the faculty were so happy since this will delay unionization. The survey results appeared to confirm this view. But it would be a serious mistake to assume that since the faculty are happy, they can be ignored. A purposeful community of professionals requires continuous attention to two-way communication and decision making processes.

This survey, showing a rather contented faculty group at the beginning of a new University administration, provides good baseline information for the new KSU administration. Periodic replications should provide some useful insight into some of the dynamics underlying progress and problems at the University.

APPENDIX

KSU Faculty Survey -- Fall, 1975

I. Demographic Information

1. Present age
2. Sex
3. College or Unit
4. Rank
5. Number of years at KSU
6. Tenure Status
7. Member of AAUP?

II. Satisfaction with your Position

1. Which of the following best describes how well you like your position (check one)?
   a. Like it very much b. Like it c. Like it a little
   d. Dislike it a little e. Dislike it f. Dislike it very much

2. How do each of the following factors affect your satisfaction with your position? (Positive effect, no effect, negative effect).
   a. Attitude of Kansas legislators and governor toward higher education.
   b. KSU policies and practices regarding tenure and promotion.
   c. The academic dean's attitude toward your dept/discipline.
   d. The national supply and demand picture regarding faculty opportunities in your discipline.
   e. The availability of extramural funds (govt., foundations) to support research and/or training in your discipline.
   f. The academic attitude and motivation of typical students in your classes.
   g. The provision for faculty input into decisions and policies affecting you.
   h. The opportunity for scholarly interaction with colleagues in other disciplines.
   i. Administrative recognition and appreciation for your professional efforts.
   j. The wisdom and fairness with which resources have been allotted to the KSU colleges.
   k. The wisdom and fairness with which resources have been allotted to the departments within your college
   l. The wisdom and fairness with which resources have been allotted to faculty members and programs within your department.
   m. The availability of intramural research funds.
   n. The allocation of intramural research funds.
   o. The academic support facilities of the university (library, computer, audiovisual aids, classrooms, etc.)
   p. The quality of your department colleagues.
   q. The quality of the university faculty in general.
   r. The Manhattan community as a place to live.
   s. The extent to which you feel that you have job security.
   t. The adequacy of the current "Fringe Benefits" program (Health insurance, contributions to retirement fund, etc)
   u. Your current salary.
   v. Additional comments.

III. Faculty Evaluation

For the past two years, written evaluations of faculty members have been required, based on criteria and procedures established by each department. These evaluations have provided the justification for recommendations for merit salary increases. Indicate your feelings about faculty evaluations procedures by answering the following questions. (Agree, Undecided, or Disagree)

1. There has been too little opportunity for faculty input into the evaluations system used by my department.
2. The system used in my department needs considerable improvement before I could endorse it as fair and valid.
3. Student ratings of instruction should not be used as a basis for faculty evaluations.
4. I have received adequate (clear, objective, etc) feedback concerning my evaluations as a faculty member.
5. As a result of written evaluations, I have received some useful ideas or suggestions on how to strengthen my performance.
6. I recommend that we dispense with written faculty evaluations and return to the more informal system employed prior to 1973-74.
7. I would like to see the "merit salary" concept replaced by a standard pay scale (based on degree, rank, and experience) together with some provision for cost of living adjustments.
8. Faculty evaluations in my department depend (too much, about right, too little) on:
   a. Teaching
   b. Research and Creative Work
   c. University Service
   d. Community Service
   e. Service to your Profession/Discipline
   f. Judgment of the Department Head
   g. Judgment of Departmental Colleagues
   h. Judgment of Students
9. (Omit this question if you were NOT on the KSU faculty before 1972). In comparison with previous years, I feel that my salary adjustments during the past two years were:
   a. More fair b. Less fair c. About as fair

IV. Retirement

Currently mandatory retirement for teaching faculty occurs at age 70.

1. As matters now stand, I expect to retire at age:
2. If retirement salary benefits were improved, I would expect to retire at age:

V. Job Security

1. In your judgment, when will enrollment declines at KSU result in the dismissal of non-tenured faculty members:
   a. Never b. By 1980 c. By 1985 d. After 1985
2. In your judgment, when will enrollment declines at KSU result in the dismissal of tenured faculty members?
   a. Never b. By 1980 c. By 1985 d. After 1985
3. What is your estimate of the probability that you will be dismissed as a result of enrollment reductions.
   a. Very Low (less than 20% chance) b. Low (20-39% chance)
   c. Medium (40-59% chance) d. High (60-79% chance) e. Very High (80-100% chance)

4. If you were seeking another position, what is your estimate of the probability that you would find a position equal to or better than your KSU position?
   a. Very low (less than 20% chance) b. Low (20-39% chance)
   c. Medium (40-59% chance) d. High (60-79% chance) e. Very High (80-100% chance).
5. Please indicate the level of priority (high, medium, low) which should be given to each of the following options to cope with potential job security problems.
   a. Tighter restrictions on the hiring of new faculty.
   b. More generous early retirement inducements.
   c. More precise definitions of lay off guidelines.
   d. Unionize the faculty.
   e. Longer-range administration planning based on enrollment trends and faculty turnover.
   f. Development of non-teaching roles for current faculty in support of the university and state.
   g. Reduce faculty salaries in order to avoid lay offs.
   h. Expand the practice of offering new faculty members "temporary positions" (appointments for definite and limited time periods).
   i. Expand educational opportunities for off-campus clienteles.
   j. Seek legislative approval for a reduced student-faculty ration.
   k. Establish tenure quotas.
6. Additional comments_____
   _____.

VI. Miscellaneous

1. I am in favor of the establishment of a collective bargaining unit at KSU (agree, undecided, disagree).
2. I would join a collective bargaining organization if established at KSU. (agree, undecided, disagree).
3. If KSU were to unionize, I would prefer the bargaining unit to consist of:
   a. KSU alone b. KSU and KU
   c. KSU, KU, WSU d. All six regents universities and colleges
4. If KSU were to unionize, I would prefer the bargaining agent to be:
   a. A local faculty group b. AAUP c. NEA
   d. AFT e. Some other Union f. Don't know
5. I would actively seek a new position if teaching loads were increased (agree, undecided, disagree).
6. I believe that eventually some kind of public accountability scheme will be required of faculty (agree, undecided, disagree).
7. If an accountability program were required, I would want one based on:
   a. An hours work procedure b. An accomplishments procedure (taught so much, published so much, etc.)
   c. The currently used faculty evaluation procedure or some similar scheme. d. Some other scheme (specify)
8. Faculty members should have freedom to communicate directly with the Board of Regents concerning matters of faculty interest (agree, undecided, disagree).
9. Faculty members should have freedom to communicate directly with the state legislature concerning matters of faculty interest (agree, undecided, disagree).

VII. Please indicate your opinions (agree, undecided, disagree) about AAUP in response to the following items

1. AAUP tends to be too liberal
2. AAUP tends to be too conservative.
3. AAUP is unnecessary at KSU due to the functioning of faculty senate.
4. AAUP doesn't do anything.
5. National AAUP dues ($12-$36) are too expensive.
6. Local AAUP dues ($5) are too expensive.
7. AAUP is a useful organization.